



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/775,181  | 02/01/2001  | Gregory Donoho       | LEX-0129-USA        | 7100             |
| 24231   | 7590        | 10/16/2003           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED<br>8800 TECHNOLOGY FOREST PLACE<br>THE WOODLANDS, TX 77381-1160 |             |                      | LI, RUIXIANG        |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 1646                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 10/16/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/775,181

Applicant(s)

DONOHO

Examiner

Ruixiang Li

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Status of Application, Amendments, and/or Claims**

Applicants' amendment in Paper No. 19 filed on August 8, 2003 has been entered in full. Claims 1-8 are currently pending and under consideration.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

### **Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §101, as set forth in the record (Paper No. 7, 10, & 17), remains. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility. The basis for this rejection is set forth in the previous Office Action (Paper No. 7, 10, & 17).

Beginning at page of 2 of the Applicants' response, Applicants continue to argue that a knockout mouse has been made in which the mouse gene homologous to that represented by SEQ ID NOS: 1 and 2 was disrupted by homologous recombination and such disruption of the mouse gene resulted in an increase in mean cholesterol and triglyceride levels in the blood of male animals, providing a utility for the present invention. Applicants further submit that the specification describes an invention (the

Art Unit: 1646

sequences which encode a novel human GPCR) that when used as described in the specification, to make a knockout mouse, provides evidence that the asserted role of the protein of the present invention in heart and coronary disease, and obesity was accurate. Thus, when the invention was used as described in the specification, it performed as predicted in the specification, to have utility directly linked to the asserted real world, highly significant, medical disorders of heart and coronary disease, and obesity.

This has been fully considered but is not deemed to be persuasive for the following reasons. As indicated in the previous Office Action, there is no support in the specification for the new information regarding the possible effect of the claimed nucleic acid and protein on blood cholesterol and triglyceride levels. Nowhere in the specification discloses that the nucleic acid and protein have any link with blood cholesterol and triglyceride levels. The specification merely mentions knockout animals and asserts that "the described NGPCRs are contemplated to be particularly useful in methods for identifying compounds useful in the therapeutic treatment of obesity, inflammation, immune disorders, diabetes, heart and coronary disease, metabolic disorders, and cancer". The present invention only provides a laundry list of diseases and fails to identify a specific and substantial utility in the diagnosis and/or treatment of obesity, heart and coronary disease, which would require significant further research. Therefore, the Applicants were not in possession of the utility at the time when the application was filed.

Art Unit: 1646

Beginning at the middle of page 3, Applicants argue that the present nucleotide sequence has a specific utility in determining the genomic structure of the corresponding human chromosome and provides biologically validated empirical data. This has been fully considered but is not deemed to be persuasive for the reasons set forth in Paper No. 10 (bottom of page 5-top of page 6).

At the bottom of page 4, Applicants argue that an additional utility includes the use of the presently claimed polynucleotides on DNA chips. Applicants submit that knowledge of the exact function or role of the presently claimed sequence is not required to track expression patterns using a DNA chip. Such "DNA chips" clearly have utility, as evidenced by hundreds of issued U.S. Patents and industrial success.

This has been fully considered but is not deemed to be persuasive for the following reasons. First, the Examiner notes that a gene chip is a customized device in biomedicine that allows researchers to detect, simultaneously, the presence and activity patterns of tens of thousands of DNA sequences in pieces of genetic material. A micro array can be used by researchers to describe the genetic malfunction associated with a disease, detect the presence of the disease in a particular patient, calculate a patient's genetic predisposition to that disease or identify the medicines likely to be most effective in treating a particular patient with the disease.

The specification fails to establish that the nucleic acid sequences are expressed at altered levels or forms in a specific diseased tissue as compared with the corresponding

Art Unit: 1646

healthy tissue. If the nucleic acid sequences were in a microarray and a compound caused decreased expression of the claimed nucleic acids, what would that mean to the skilled artisan? Is it a potential drug, or would administering the compound be likely to exacerbate an unspecified disease? If it had been disclosed that the nucleic acid sequences are expressed at a higher level in a particular diseased tissue as compared with the corresponding healthy tissue, the skilled artisan would know that a compound that decreased expression of the nucleic acid molecules is a good drug candidate that targets the disease. It is not the case here.

Furthermore, the nucleic acid sequences may very well be expressed at equivalent levels in healthy tissues. If it were the case, then the compound would not be a good drug candidate. The nucleic acid sequences may also very well be expressed at a lower level in a particular diseased tissue as compared to the corresponding healthy tissue. Then a compound that decreased expression of the claimed polynucleotides would *not* be a good potential drug. Evidence of a differential expression might serve as a basis for use of nucleic acid sequences as a diagnostic for a disease. However, in the absence of any disclosed relationship between the nucleic acid molecules (or proteins encoded by the nucleic acids) and any diseases or disorders, any information obtained from an expression profile would only serve as the basis for further research on the observation itself. "Congress intended that no patent be granted on a chemical compound whose sole 'utility' consists of its potential role as an object of use-testing." *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 USPQ at 696. Thus, the disclosure does not present a substantial utility that would support the requirement of 35 U.S.C. §101.

Art Unit: 1646

Finally, the issued U.S. Patents related to DNA chips merely show that the technology itself is important and useful; they do not show that claimed invention has a patentable utility. Industrial success is not a standard for utility requirement. There is no doubt that a gene chip (or DNA chips) is a valuable tool in gene expression monitoring and drug discovery. However, the claims are not drawn to the technique, rather to nucleic acids which have not been disclosed as being associated with any particular diseases. Any such nucleic acid molecules could be added to a micro array. The use of the claimed uncharacterized nucleic acid molecules in such studies would have provided no more valuable information than the use of any other unidentified nucleic acids. Thus, this asserted utility is not specific. Determining the relationship between the claimed nucleic acid molecules and any specific diseases or disorders would require significant further research. Therefore, this asserted utility is also not substantial.

At page 6, Applicants challenges the legality of the Patent Examination Utility Guidelines and the validity of issued US patents. It is noted that an Examiner has no authority to comment on the legality of the Guidelines and the validity of US Patents.

In summary, the specification fails to provide a specific, substantial, and credible utility, or a well-established utility for the claimed invention.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U. S. C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph**

The rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph, as set forth in the previous Office Action (Paper No. 7 & 10 and Advisory Action), remains.

Art Unit: 1646

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific, substantial, and credible utility, or a well-established utility, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention. The basis for this rejection is set forth in the previous Office Action (Paper No. 7 & 10; Advisory Action).

The applicants' arguments about the patentable utility of the claimed invention has been fully considered but is not deemed to be persuasive for the reasons set forth above.

#### **Conclusion**

No claims are allowed.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.



Art Unit: 1646

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruixiang Li whose telephone number is (703) 306-0282. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am-5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, can be reached on (703) 308-6564. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [yvonne.eyler@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Ruixiang Li  
Examiner  
October 12, 2003

*Gary A. Kunz*  
**GARY KUNZ**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**